energy throwing up knowledge and activity out of
itself and of which therefore Tapas is the character,
and a passive consciousness in which consciousness
does not act as an energy, but only exists as a status.
and of which therefore absence of Tapas or force
in action is the character. Is the apparent absence
of Tapas in this state real, or is there such an effective
distinction in Sachchidananda? It is affirmed that
there is: the dual status of Brahman, quiescent and
creative, is indeed one of the most important and
fruitful distinctions in Indian philosophy; it **is**
besides a fact of spiritual experience.
Here let us observe, first, that by this passivity
in ourselves we arrive from particular and broken
knowledge at a greater, a one and a unifying
knowledge; secondly, that if, in the state of passivity,
we open ourselves entirely to what is beyond, we can
become aware of a Power acting upon us which we
feel to be not our own in the limited egoistic sense,
but universal or transcendental, and that this Power
works through us for a greater play of knowledge^
a greater play of energy, action and result, which
also we feel to be not our own, but that of the
Divine, of Sachchidananda, ourselves only its field

or channel. The result happens in both cases
because our individual consciousness rests from an
ignorant limited action and opens itself to the
supreme status or to the supreme action. In the
latter, the more dynamic opening, there is power
and play of knowledge and action, and that is
Tapas; but in the former also, in the static